



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MAIL

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.  
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD  
SUITE 370  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

MAY 04 2005  
DIRECTOR OFFICE  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

In re Application of: Watanabe  
Application No. 10/791,734  
Filed: March 4, 2004  
For: DATA MIGRATION METHOD

DECISION ON PETITION  
TO MAKE SPECIAL  
(ACCELERATED EXAMINATION)  
UNDER M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII)

This is a response to the petition filed 24 March 2005, under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.

The Petition is **DISMISSED**.

M.P.E.P. §708.02, Section VIII which sets out the prerequisites for a grantable petition for Accelerated Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) states in relevant part:

A new application (one which has not received any examination by the examiner) may be granted special status provided that applicant (and this term includes applicant's attorney or agent) complies with each of the following items:

- (a) Submits a petition to make special accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h);
- (b) Presents all claims directed to a single invention, or if the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status;
- (c) Submits a statement(s) that a pre-examination search was made, listing the field of search by class and subclass, publication, Chemical Abstracts, foreign patents, etc. The pre-examination search must be directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested. A search made by a foreign patent office satisfies this requirement;
- (d) Submits one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record; and
- (e) Submits a detailed discussion of the references, which discussion points out, with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

In those instances where the request for this special status does not meet all the prerequisites set forth above, **applicant will be notified and the defects in the request will be stated**. The application will remain in the status of a new


application awaiting action in its regular turn. In those instances where a request is defective in one or more respects, applicant will be given one opportunity to perfect the request in a renewed petition to make special. If perfected, the request will then be granted. If not perfected in the first renewed petition, any additional renewed petitions to make special may or may not be considered at the discretion of the Technology Center (TC) Special Program Examiner.

The petition filed 24 March 2005 fails to adequately meet requirement (e) of the criteria set forth above. The discussion of the references does not point out with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111(b) and (c) how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references. The discussion of the references is confusing. Petitioner states that the "present invention as recited in the claims is not taught or suggested by any of the above noted references". Petitioner then goes on to state that the references fail to disclose or suggest essentially all of the limitations of independent claim 1. It is not clear if these statements are intended to mean that none of the elements of claim 1 are disclosed by the references or that the entirety of claim 1 is not disclosed by the references. If the intent is the former, it would be difficult to conclude that the search was directed to the claimed invention if essentially *none* of the claim limitations were found in the prior art deemed "most closely related". If the intent is the latter, a statement that the entirety of independent claim 1 is not disclosed by the four references purported to be "most closely related" is not a sufficient detailed description. Clarification is required. Petitioner then further states that one of the references, Ofek '640, fails to disclose the limitation of "the host computer . . . independently access[ing] either the old storage system or the new storage system prior to the data migration phase". Petitioner then additionally states that the "above described deficiencies of Ofek et al '640 are also evident in each of the above described references". It is unclear whether this is intended to refer to the specific limitation discussed above, to all of the limitations of claim 1, or to the entirety of claim 1. Clarification is required.

Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.

Petitioner is given one opportunity to perfect the petition. Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the mail date of this decision.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.



Pinchus M. Laufer  
Special Program Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security  
571-272-3599